

Francis J. SCAHILL, *et al.*
Serial No. 10/522,024
November 4, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1, 7, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being made “obvious” based on Jebara in view of newly cited Gusler ‘064 is respectfully traversed.

As earlier noted in the record of this application, Jebara teaches continuous monitoring of all conversation from all parties during a group discussion (i.e., speech exchanged between plural persons) using a speech recognition computer that acts as a mediator for the group meeting, offering feedback and relevant questions to stimulate further conversation.

However, as the Examiner has recognized, Jebara does not teach an information interface system where speech recognition is activated only at some time during an on-going exchange of voice signals, etc.

To supply this admitted deficiency, the Examiner now relies upon Gusler ‘064.

However, while Gusler does teach some selective use of speech recognition during a conversation, the Gusler teaching is inherently contrary to the Jebara teaching and, therefore, it cannot possibly have been “obvious” for one of only ordinary skill in the art to make the combination now proposed by the Examiner.

Francis J. SCAHILL, *et al.*
Serial No. 10/522,024
November 4, 2008

In particular, Gusler teaches either manual deactivation of the entire speech recognition function or selectively de-cluttering of input conversation speech so as to eliminate all but the customer's speech for analysis. Such selective de-cluttering so as to analyze only a single one of plural voices in a conversation is directly contrary to the Jebara teaching where all voices to the conversation are continuously monitored.

Nevertheless, the Examiner alleges that it would have been "obvious" to modify Jebara as taught by Gusler "because Gusler et al. provides methods and systems employing computerized speech recognition and capturing customer speech to improve customer service (Paragraph [0043]) by de-cluttering the speech input for better automatic processing, by removing all but the pertinent words spoken by the customer (Paragraph [0006], lines 15-21)."

Of course, Jebara's system is not directed towards capturing customer speech, or towards improving customer service by any de-cluttering of speech input or the like. As previously noted, the Jebara teaching is directly contrary to the selective speech recognition/analysis teachings of Gusler and, therefore, it cannot possibly have been "obvious" to the hypothetical artisan of only ordinary skill in the art to make the modification now proposed by the Examiner.

Francis J. SCAHILL, *et al.*
Serial No. 10/522,024
November 4, 2008

In any event, independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended above so as to patentably distinguish over any possible combination of teachings from these two references, even if the Examiner's proposed modification is considered *arguendo*.

The independent claims 1 and 8 are now limited to speech recognition control arranged to automatically activate speech recognition in response to an operating system event automatically generated when a caller identification phase is completed. Support for this amendment can be found on page 29, lines 3-15 of the specification.

Gusler discloses that the speech recognition system can be muted manually by a service representative – or automatically steered so as to analyze only customer speech. Neither Gusler nor Jebara disclose that the speech recognizer is activated in response to an operating system event automatically generated when a caller identification phase is completed (for example, as the user closes a window containing an on-screen form after completion of the form).

Given the fundamental deficiencies already noted with respect to independent claims 1 and 8, it is not believed necessary at this time to discuss the additional deficiencies of this allegedly “obvious” combination of references with respect to dependent claims 7 and 14.

Francis J. SCAHILL, *et al.*
Serial No. 10/522,024
November 4, 2008

The rejection of claims 2-6 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being made “obvious” based on Jebara/Gusler in further view of Rhodes *et al.* is also respectfully traversed.

Fundamental deficiencies of the alleged Jebara/Gusler combination have already been noted above for parent claims 1 and 8. Rhodes does not supply those deficiencies. Accordingly, it is not believed necessary at this time to detail additional deficiencies of this allegedly “obvious” three-way combination of references.

An alternative way of activating the applicants’ speech recognition, namely, by using the timer (see specification at page 28, lines 31-34), is addressed by new independent claims 15 and 16. Such a time-based activation of speech recognition functions is contrary to the cited references.


Two new dependent claims 17 and 18 focus on the operating system event being generated by the completion of an on-screen form.

Francis J. SCAHILL, *et al.*
Serial No. 10/522,024
November 4, 2008

Accordingly, this entire application is now believed to be in allowable condition,
and a formal notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Larry S. Nixon
Reg. No. 25,640

LSN:lef

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100